DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 338 595 SP 033 401

AUTHOR Koppich, Julia E.
TITLE The Changing Role of Teacher Union Leaders.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Collective Bargaining; Collegiality; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Leaders; *Leadership Styles; School Districts; Superintendents; *Teacher Welfare; *Unions
IDENTIFIERS Cincinnati Public Schools OH; *Collaborative Bargaining; Miami Public Schools FL; Pittsburgh School District PA; Rochester City School District NY

ABSTRACT

A central feature of the emergent pattern of educational reform is exemplified by alterations in the ways in which leaders of teachers' unions perceive themselves, their roles, and the relationship of their organization to their school district. Data for the study described here were derived principally from visits to and interviews with selected teacher union leaders in four cities--Pittsburgh (Pennsylvania), Rochester (New York), Cincinnati (Ohio), and Miami (Florida)--where practices such as site-based management, peer review, and differentiated staffing are prominent. Teacher union leaders in the four districts are collaborating with school authorities to create a different kind of school district. The union is no longer viewed, nor does it view itself, as an outsider to the education system; union leaders are becoming players in the system, assuming joint responsibility with the superintendents for the long-term survival and health of the school district. Much about the collective bargaining relationship is also changing from an adversarial stance to win-win negotiations, nonconflictual interest bargaining, and consensual decision making. Union leaders are increasingly developing allies and coalitions in the business and civic communities as well. The new type of union leader shows five key attributes: commitment to the union, vision of the future, intense understanding of politics, willingness to take risks, and desire to see change through to completion. (AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Koppich

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED338595

THE CHANGING ROLE OF TEACHER UNION LEADERS[1]

by
Julia E. Koppich
University of California, Berkeley

Introduction

"Schools and unions are a mismatch with the times."

The statement quoted above is not the musing of a labor heretic or the outburst of an education infidel. Rather, it is a carefully considered public proclamation by the elected president of a prominent teachers' union chapter. This statement about schools and unions being out of sync with the times serves to frame an examination of the evolving roles of various sets of education leaders within the context of contemporary education reform.

[1]Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Education Research Association, Chicago, April 1991.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP 033 401

The reform movement which began in this nation in 1983 is attempting to bring dramatic changes to America's education landscape. New directions for education are encompassed in a broad array of policies designed to revitalize preservice and inservice teacher preparation, intensify the academic rigor of students' courses of study, develop new ways to measure and assess student achievement, and encourage professional educators generally to rethink the ways in which public schools are organized for teaching and learning.

Within this expanse of change, an unusual organizational phenomenon seems to be underway. A central feature of the emergent pattern of education change is exemplified by alterations in the ways in which leaders of teachers' unions perceive themselves, their roles, and the relationship of their organization to their school district.

This paper is an introductory exploration of this phenomenon of changing professional roles of teacher union leaders. The genesis of this effort principally is Claremont Project VISION, an in-progress examination of education and labor relations reform across the United States. Data are derived from visits to and interviews with selected teacher union leaders in four cities—Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Rochester, New York; Cincinnati, Ohio; and Miami (Dade County), Florida. Additional corroborating data were gleaned from a more localized education reform/labor relations effort, the Educational Policy Trust Agreement Project, which operates in California.

We begin with a brief review of current education reform efforts, then proceed to a closer examination of some of the emerging manifestations of teacher union leaders' organizational role changes. The paper next posits a tentative typology of emerging teacher union leadership, raises some still-to-be-answered questions, and concludes with some thoughts about the shape of educational unions and the roles of their leaders.

Education Reform in Modern Dress

A Nation at Risk was published in 1983 with its now-famous warning that a "rising tide of mediocrity" threatened to engulf the nation's schools. This small book, issued by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, a prestigious *ad hoc* panel chaired by University of California President David Gardner, sounded an education call to arms and unleashed a firestorm of reform activity in the United States. Written in language reminiscent of calls for national defense build-ups in times of foreign military threat, the report succeeded in capturing and holding the nation's attention.

Among the indicators of an education system gone soft which were cited by the National Commission were: American students' poor showing on international comparisons of academic achievement; a quarter-century-long decline in student scores on standardized tests; the twenty years downward spiral in average SAT scores; and the American business community's increasingly vocal concern about the millions of dollars it was spending on remedial programs for new employees who had recently graduated from American high schools.

A Nation at Risk was the first of a series of reports to offer reasons and recommendations for the improvement of the nation's schools. The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, the Committee for Economic Development, and the National Governors' Association were among the chorus of prominent organizations which publicly called for school reform.

A Nation at Risk took the public schools to task for contributing to America's flagging economic competitiveness. The reports which followed throughout the 1980s have echoed a similar and repeated theme: The road back to economic security for the United States, the path to regaining economic competitiveness, leads from the nation's schools. The reverberations produced by A Nation at Risk and its successors have triggered a wave of reform activity in the states.

Nationwide enthusiasm for education reform has been fueled by the United States' increasing anxiety about the possibility of becoming an economic junior partner, particularly to Japan. Pleas for American school reform are mounted against a backdrop of anxiety about the nation's economy, the United States' ability to compete in the global market, and the capacity of the American work force to adapt to the work place challenges of the twenty-first century. Contemporary reform discussions thus center on the need to increase educational productivity, enhance human capital, and prepare workers who, in the twenty-first century, will be required to "think for a living."

Corporate executives, among the most enthusiastic proponents of education reform, loudly have asserted that the education system functionally is related to employment and that public education is

failing to prepare sufficient numbers of individuals to function productively in an increasingly complex job market. Some of business leaders' most strident criticisms of American education have been reserved for the way in which local school systems are managed.

Just one year prior to the onset of the education reform movement, in 1982, readers from the corporate world and beyond had made Thomas Peters' and Robert Waterman's In Search of Excellence a national bestseller. Peters and Waterman detailed lessons from America's best-run companies. The authors outlined the attributes of successful corporations and employed these indicators as a template against which to measure other American industries.

Many of those advocating school reform took a page from the corporate book and began to look to the business world for guidance. They discovered striking parallels between schools and corporations.

When indicators of productive corporations were translated to the school arena, those who wanted to reform American education quickly recognized that schools, as modern, productive organizations fell short on almost every dimension of Peters' and Waterman's scale of success. Where successful corporations are governed by a deeply ingrained corporate culture, most school districts lacked this level of shared commitment, this "corporate" ownership. Where most productive companies encourage experimentation and individual initiative, school districts more often relied on standardized curriculum and tolerated little deviation from standard practice. Where successful corporations have adopted participatory styles of

management, most school districts continued to be based on a top-down, factory model of operation.

There was an additional element in the formula for change in some of the Peters and Waterman "best" companies. Running on a parallel track with changes in management structure and operation, restructuring was being undertaken by the labor unions representing the industries' employees. Union leaders in these companies had begun to adopt different public postures, pursue different political strategies, and develop new, more collaborative relationships with corporate management. Worker involvement, participatory management, and union-management cooperation were becoming part of the new corporate lexicon in some small but influential number of American industries.

The education reform reports of the early and mid 1980s provided the American education system with a mandate for wholesale change. Implicit in the proposed change strategies was a set of expectations about new roles for key educational actors. If schools were fundamentally to change "the way we do business here," then the leaders of educational institutions and organizations would need to rethink their traditional place in the "corporate" social order.

Reform in Bold Relief

No role exists in a social or political vacuum. The context for the role changes we are witnessing in teacher union leaders is the education reform movement.

The districts which are included in this study have embraced many of the reform recommendations emanating from the reports of the 1980s. Pittsburgh, Rochester, Cincinnati, and Miami, as well as some of the California school districts which are part of the trust agreement effort, simultaneously are implementing a number of large-scale changes, many of which cut to the heart of what we know as "school." These districts are pioneering site-based management (Site-Based Management/Shared Decisionmaking in Dade), peer review, and differentiated staffing (the Career in Teaching Program in Rochester).

None of these districts represents a case of education reform behind closed doors. This is public change in a public enterprise. For good or ill, publicity has become part of these districts' daily existence.

Redefining Teacher Union Leadership

Leaders of teacher unions historically modelled themselves on their industry forbears. Typically they were tough, often combative, and generally adversarial in their dealing with school management. The stereotype did not always fit the individual, but the image stuck nonetheless. The union leaders in reforming school districts are changing both the style of their approach and the substance of their actions.

This set of union leaders expresses a new sense of urgency about schooling in the United States. They understand intellectually that American education is at a crossroads. They feel viscerally that their own school districts are in trouble.

Rochester's dropout rate is unacceptable. Miami's burgeoning immigrant population is creating new educational challenges for that district. Pittsburgh and Cincinnati are confronted with the myriad problems plaguing many of the nation's urban school systems. As Rochester Teachers Association President Adam Urbanski explained, "However one viewed the circumstances [prior to reform efforts]—politically, pragmatically, educationally—[it was clear] that what was needed was a change in kind, not a change in degree." This "change in kind" is reflected in the education reforms these districts and their teacher unions are undertaking and in the actions of the union leadership.

Reshaping the Box

Teacher union leaders conventionally worked "within the box." "The box" was the traditional hierarchical school district. The superintendent functioned as the chief executive officer; the district trustees sat as the corporate board of directors. The union was outside the official circle of corporate authority. The relationship between union and management largely was circumscribed by industrial-style labor-management relations.

Teacher union leaders in Dade, Rochester, Pittsburgh, and Miami, and their counterpart superintendents, now are attempting collaboratively to create a new "box." The union in these districts no longer is viewed by school management or the governing board, and does not view itself, as an "outsider." Rather, the union has become central to district efforts to restructure the education system. Union

leaders are becoming players "in the system," but in a new system, one they are helping to craft and shape.

Union leaders and superintendents are assuming joint responsibility for the long-term survival and health of the school district. This proactive, "we're responsible for what goes on here" attitude of union leadership clearly is reflected in a statement by Al Fondy, President of the Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers. Says Fondy:

> A union shares the responsibility for assuring the effectiveness, stability, and long-term viability and success of the institution or enterprise in which its members are employed.... ... If you've got a union that's in a strong position, if it represents people and has what people recognize to be power ... and influence..., then you have responsibility. In other words, if there are problems in the school system and the union is strong, then the union is responsible either for the fact that the problem exists in the first place, or at least responsible for the fact that the problems are not being addressed.

Fondy's statement captures the essence of this emerging shift in union focus and direction. The union increasingly is seen—by school management, governing boards, and an often active business community—as a legitimate vehicle for school reform and restructuring. Union leaders are perceiving their organizations as legitimately bound not only to serve the conventionally defined

interests of the organization's members, but to further the overall health and well-being of the school district.

Teacher unions, under Al Fondy and his compatriots, are taking on explicit education reform roles. In the process, union leaders are establishing new rules and altering—or breaking—old ones. Says Rochester's Adam Urbanski, "We don't play the same game anymore." Nowhere is this more evident than in the newly expanded and redefined collective bargaining arena.

Redirecting Labor Relations

If education reform is not business as usual, neither does it set the stage for labor relations as usual. The scope and strategy of union-district relations and agreements is expanding as union leaders, and the superintendents with whom they work, turn the conventional wisdom of labor-management relations on its head.

The classic dance between teacher union and school district management is often a predictable one. For example, in textbook collective bargaining scenarios, which often are played out in the "real world," the union makes economic "demands" and then absolves itself of responsibility for locating the requisite funds in the school district budget. Management's typical response to union demands for money is, "Trust us. We don't have any." And so the dance begins, culminating finally in a bilateral contract, but often only after much acrimony, charges and counter-charges, and rancorous wrangling.

In the matter of enforcing the negotiated contract, "Management acts, the union grieves" conventionally is the defining

principle. Under this set of circumstances, union leaders view their role principally as protecting the economic interests of their members and preserving clearly delineated, often narrowly defined contractual rights. The traditional workplace relationship, then, has been defined as one in which management makes the decisions and unions enforce the contract.

Much about the collective bargaining relationship is changing in Pittsburgh, Miami, Rochester, Dade, and some of the California districts we have examined. Adversarial labor relations are giving way to "win-win" negotiations, nonconflictual "interest bargaining," and consensual decisionmaking. Contract negotiations are viewed by neither the union nor school district leadership as a zero-sum game in which there must be victors and vanquished.

Says Rochester's Urbanski:

> I used to enjoy being adversarial [with the former superintendent]. [But] I would feel guilty taking advantage of McWalters [the current superintendent]. We have built a relationship of trust and professional loyalty that goes beyond the contract. I would warn him if I saw him doing something the union would have trouble with....

Instead of staking out territory and drawing a bargaining line in the sand, negotiations become part of an on-going problem solving strategy in an arena in which discussions are as likely to center on broad educational concerns as on strictly defined "teacher interests."

Union leaders are redefining the purpose and format of the contract as well. Says Rochester's Urbanski, "The contract is the

floor, not the ceiling, for what teachers should be willing to do for students." Negotiated contracts in districts we have studied include detailed provisions on topics such as site-based management, participatory budget development, peer review, and professional development. Extra-contract agreements—side letters, trust agreements, memoranda of understanding—are employed with increasing frequency to expand the range of mutually developed educational policy.

We believe that what we are witnessing in these few districts is not simply new bargaining about old policies. Rather, there is a fundamental shift underway in the purpose and result of labor-management interactions. These districts appear to have entered what Kerchner and Mitchell label the third generation of labor relations, the "era of negotiated policy."

Another indication of the shift in the routines of collective bargaining is reflected in the source of ideas which eventually make their way into written agreements. Rochester's Urbanski told us, "Much of what is different ... is not in substance but in who is saying it, and who owns it." Teacher unions, through their leaders, are taking ownership of outcomes for students. They are dealing consciously with education's "big ticket" items.

Union leadership is employing an expanded public vocabulary—professionalism, accountability, productivity, outcomes, achievement, results—to describe the purpose of their organization and the work of their members. These are not the words of a traditional trade unionist. Union leadership is asking, and attempting to answer, questions such as, "What is good teaching?", "What does

'accountability' mean in education?," and "How do we measure educational productivity?."

Accountability—defining it, measuring it, insuring it—has been a centerpiece of the latest (and as yet unsuccessful) effort to negotiate a successor contract in Rochester. The superintendent and the union president jointly hosted a series of forums for parents, teachers, and district administrators designed to initiate public conversations about educational accountability.

Pittsburgh's Al Fondy engages his members in open dialogue about educational productivity, which he defines as, "getting more of the kids to learn and all the kids to learn more." Says Fondy:

> "... Even if you were a narrow person who just looked at it from the union standpoint like, 'We want to keep decent salaries,' and 'We want to keep strengthening the professionalism of teachers,' you can't keep doing that, especially in terms of salaries, unless you can make some kind of argument that the productivity of what you're doing is increasing."

In sum, this set of union leaders is thinking and talking more explicitly and more publicly about educational policy as well as conceiving of that policy in broader terms. Discussions, both formal and informal, encompass topics formerly considered by management to be taboo or the union to be off-limits.

Union leaders are effecting change by making new use of old skills. These union presidents are trained organizers. They are putting their apparently transferable organizing skills to good advantage as they negotiate, compromise, and campaign to change

the educational operations of their districts and expand the purpose and responsibility of their union.

No Longer Strange Bedfellows

The teacher union leaders whom we have observed are playing in a larger, more complicated, and more public political arena. Union leaders are developing new sets of allies and forming and becoming involved in new coalitions.

In many locales, the business and civic communities have become conspicuous union, as well as school district, partners. In Rochester, this new partnership takes the form of Rochester Brainpower, a potent coalition of Xerox, Kodak, and Bausch and Lomb. Dade County's Partnerships in Education (PIE) is a collaborative effort of the union, the school district, Miami-Dade Community College, and the Dade branch of the Urban League. Dade's Chamber of Commerce also is a visible, supportive player on the education reform scene. In Cincinnati, Proctor and Gamble is among the most active corporate partners in an often union-led campaign for school reform.

As can be seen from the discussion of collective bargaining in the previous section of this paper, school district management and union leadership also are forging a new alliance. Where previously union leadership was quick to "attack" management actions—"The decision must be wrong because management made it"—and management was equally prone to criticize the union, now a new mood of conciliation and cooperation pervades interactions between district and union leadership. This new attitude and set of interactions extends beyond the collective bargaining table.

A particular symbiosis seems to be at work here. Teacher union leaders have forged a set of common goals and expectations in their school districts. They share values with their respective superintendents about education, the district, even about the union. The union is committed to preserving and strengthening the district as a viable educational entity. The district reciprocates with a tacit commitment to the institutional integrity of the union. Public actions demonstrate intentions.

The "Pat and Joe Show," featuring Joseph Fernandez, then-superintendent in Miami, and Pat Tornillo of the Dade teachers union, was a staple of efforts to gain widespread public support for the district's proposed education changes. Tom Mooney, the union president in Cincinnati, is part of the district's strategic planning process and a member of the Goals and Long Range Planning Group in Cincinnati.

Rochester superintendent Peter McWalters and union president Adam Urbanski often appear together in public education forums. McWalters describes his union counterpart as "an educational leader who also happens to be president of the teachers' union." In these districts, the local teacher union leadership is considered an integral part of any potentially successful efforts to win internal and external acceptance of reform innovations.

Despite this new cooperative, collegial arrangement, the relationship between union president and superintendent seems not to be dependent on a personal friendship between the players. Rochester's McWalters and Urbanski seem to be "intellectual soul mates." The union leaders and their counterpart superintendents in

the other districts maintain a more arms-length, though no less productive, relationship.

Restructuring the District, Restructuring the Union

Union structure tends to mirror the structure of the school district. The district traditionally represents strong, centralized power. The superintendent is in charge. Orders go forth from the district office to lower level administrators at school sites.

A parallel structure tends to exist in local teachers' unions. A strong president (or sometimes an executive director) often directs basic union strategy from a centralized location. The contract is "owned" by teachers, but "held" by union headquarters.

The reforming school districts which we have visited are moving increasingly toward devolving authority from central office to school sites. This process is having the effect of loosening the superintendent's centralized hold on day-to-day school operations.

The transfer of authority to schools is producing a similar effect on the internal organization of the union. Union leaders are relinquishing some of their own centralized power as teachers at individual school sites assume broader policy authority.

Some reforming districts, for example, have negotiated procedures for contract waivers, which often are accompanied by procedures for waivers of district governing board policies. This release from standardized rules allows local schools to craft programs and policies tailored to the needs of their particular students. In a sense, the message that goes forth both from union and district

headquarters is, "We trust teachers/members to make sound educational decisions for students."

A Developing Typology of Union Leadership in Reforming Districts

The individuals who are the subject of this study are vastly different in personality, temperament, age, interests, and background. Were it not for the common union connection, Al Fondy of Pittsburgh, Pat Tornillo of Dade County, Tom Mooney of Cincinnati, and Adam Urbanski of Rochester would not likely form a natural affinity group.

What, then, can be said about teacher union leaders in reforming school districts? Do they share a set of common characteristics? Is there an emerging typology which defines union leaders in restructuring organizations?

The answer to this question seems to be a tentative, "yes." Though different in notable ways, these union leaders share at least five key attributes. They are: 1) commitment to the union; 2) vision of the future; 3) intense understanding of politics; 4) willingness to take risks; and 5) desire to see change through.

Commitment to the Union

The union as an organization constitutes a specific belief system. Union members adhere to an established credo, and subscribe to a particular set of principles. Songs, slogans, celebrations, and folklore form the union liturgy which is passed from one generation of member to the next.

Teacher union leaders have internalized this belief system. They hold to the union, what it stands for, what it represents. This

strong emotional attachment to the organization, however, does not blind these leaders to the union's frailties or to the organization's need to change with the times.

None of the presidents believes the union as an institution has outgrown its usefulness. Each sees the organization as essential and viable, an integral part of the fabric of the public education system in their districts. Yet all are persuaded the organization must change.

These leaders have chosen to build on the existing organization in order to create a new one. They view their union's history as a tradition from which lessons may be learned and experiences taken.

Vision of the Future

"Vision" is an overused buzz word, part of the now standard vernacular of organizational "restructuring." But vision is not an empty word in the context of evolving roles of teacher union leaders.

In his own way each of the union leaders whom we have met is a visionary. Each has developed a conceptual road map, and each leader is able to articulate a carefully conceived, crafted, and tailored set of goals for his organization. Interestingly, each leader's vision for the union nests within his larger vision for the school district.

Union leaders also share a vision for education with their respective superintendents. This shared vision serves as a touchpoint for collaborative action.

Political Savvy

Each of the leaders whom we observed is a skilled, consummate politician, in the best sense of the term. Each understands systems and organizations, knows how to assemble and

participate productively in coalitions, and is able to interact effectively with a wide variety of people.

These leaders are able to "play politics" at multiple levels. They function in the political world of the school district and the corporate and civic communities.

These presidents also are performing a delicate balancing act. They must satisfy the needs and expectations of their "old" constituents, those who say, "I remember the union when," while at the same time moving the union forward and ministering to a set of "new" constituents who may have different expectations for their professional organization.

Willingness to Take Risks

"Change is inevitable. Only growth is optional." Adam Urbanski's admonition to his members has been taken to heart by his union leader colleagues. Each of the union leaders has accepted the challenge to capitalize on opportunities for change.

Risks come cloaked in various disguises. There are risks for those whom the union represents. These leaders are sending teachers into uncharted professional territory—site-based management, peer review, lead teacher status and responsibility. This action, asking members to venture into the unknown with, perhaps, unanticipated consequences, is counterintuitive for their own self-preservation as union leader.

Thus, there are personal risks for union presidents as they place their own political position within their union in jeopardy. These leaders are putting their personal prestige on the line as they

advocate, both inside and outside the union, for major institutional and organizational changes.

In short, these union leaders have elected to swim against the tide, challenging what unions are "supposed" to be and do in their efforts to establish a new set of expectations for the organization and its members. This willingness to take risks and embrace new challenges in tinged with more than a little political pragmatism. As one union leader told us in a conversation about change, "If we don't do it ourselves, they'll do it to us."

Desire to See Change Through

Change is slow, deliberate, and often plodding. Union presidents in reforming districts seem instinctively to understand this and to take the long view.

All of the union leaders whom we interviewed said, in different words, "We're in this for the long haul." None sees change as an easy undertaking or a short-term commitment. None is seeking a quick flash of glory to move on to higher office.

Many outsiders were surprised when Adam Urbanski did not leave office after his Rochester teachers rejected the contract he had negotiated with district management. Pat Tornillo and Tom Mooney have been involved in their districts' reform efforts since the beginning, and as often reflect on the frustrations as on the triumphs. Al Fondy is the only union president in the memories of many Pittsburgh teachers. None of these individuals is of a mind to "cut and run," when situations become difficult and problems seem to defy solution.

Each of these union leaders, then—Tom Mooney of Cincinnati, Adam Urbanski of Rochester, Pat Tornillo of Miami, and Al Fondy of Pittsburgh—possesses a set of common qualities. Each is committed to the union, has a vision for the future, is possessed of great political savvy, is willing to take risks, and desires to see change through to its logical conclusion.

Unanswered Questions and an Unfinished Agenda

This paper is a quite preliminary exploration of evolving role changes of teacher union leaders within the context of education reform. Just as reform remains an unfinished agenda, so, too, does the emerging role of union leaders remain only partially formed.

This research has raised a number of still-to-be-answered questions. For example: Can the new relationship between union and management, the new way of doing business, "hold" in times of crisis?

Rochester has encountered a series of potentially deadly setbacks in its efforts to reach agreement on a new contract. Can the cooperation which has marked Rochester's reform efforts continue in the wake of contract rejections, first by the union and then by the district? The California school districts which tangentially are part of this study are in the throes of a severe fiscal crisis which threatens to tear the delicate fabric of labor-management relations. Will newly developed agreements come unravelled as the money squeeze grows tighter?

A second not-yet-settled issue is whether teachers fully can accept new roles for their union leaders and the new responsibilities which must follow for themselves. The larger question is, can the organization change without spinning apart?

Some of the union presidents have been challenged in internal leadership elections. Each has won reelection, but for each, the challenge represented the first instance in his tenure in office that a contested election was held. In the California districts, there is expected to be some voluntary union leadership turnover in the near term. Will new leadership be elected on "reform" platforms, or will the reformers be ousted by union traditionalists?

A third unanswered question is: Are we simply witnessing a cult of personality? Is momentum for change dependent crucially on these particular individuals, or has it/will it take on a life of its own?

Finally, if change is real, will it spread? Is this the birth of a new professional unionism, or simply an aberration brought about by this particular, perhaps transitory reform movement?

Conclusion

Reform is not a linear process. Change is, alternately, dynamic, lurching, staggering, and with frustrating regularity, a case of "one step forward, two steps back." We are spectators to a work-in-progress. Thus, any conclusions must be stated as tentative ones.

The goals of an organization determine the behavior of its leadership. Change in the behavior of teacher union leaders is creating new role definitions for the office and new expectations for the organization. The union leaders with whom we have become

acquainted have expanded the goals for their organization. Their own roles, responsibilities, and obligations have become enlarged in the process.

These leaders have expanded boundaries of the union's professional relationship with school management and changed notion of "school community." They are, in effect, in the process of creating a new ideology of unionism.

None of the foregoing is meant to suggest that union-management cooperation is absolute. Tension still exists and undoubtedly always will. Communities of interest between employees (even professional employees) and employers never entirely will overlap. This is, indeed, a fragile partnership in an unstable coalition.

Yet, what seems to be emerging is a new definition of union, a new definition of unionists, and a new definition of union leaders. The curriculum of the school for teacher union presidents is being rewritten by the leaders who are the subjects of this study.

Says Rochester's Urbanski: "There are some people saying, 'Wait a minute, this is not the way I remember unions.' I say [they] are right."

The same may be said of the union leadership.

References

Abbott, Jan. "New Approaches to Collective Bargaining and Workplace Relations: Do They Work?," Fremont: The Ross Consulting Group, 1989.

Grace, Gerald R. Role Conflict and the Teacher, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1972.

Fondy, Albert. "A Statement of Philosophy and Objectives," Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers, 1988.

Herrington, Carolyn. "NEA's New President: Perspectives on the Union's Role for the Nineties," Politics of Education Association Newsletter, Washington, D.C.: American Education Research Association, Winter 1990-91.

Kerchner, Charles T. and Douglas E. Mitchell. The Changing Idea of a Teachers' Union, London: The Falmer Press, 1988.

Kerchner, Charles T., Byron King, Julia Koppich, et. al., "Educational Reform Policy and Labor Relations in the 1990s," Claremont: The Claremont Graduate School, 1991.

Kerchner, Charles T. Interview with Albert Fondy, President, Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers, October 1990.

Kerchner, Charles T. Interview with Paul Francis, Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers, March 20, 1990.

Koppich, Julia E. and Charles T. Kerchner. Interview with Adam Urbanski, President, Rochester Teachers Association, May 31. 1990.

Koppich Julia E. Interview with Adam Urbanski, President, Rochester Teachers Association, November 14, 1990.

Maeroff, Gene I. The Empowerment of Teachers, New York: Teachers College Press, 1988.